

0 2 JUN 1993

\*\*\*\* PROFS note for AANDRADE 2 Jun 1993 15:06 Page 1 of 2

From: PHAGLION--VCH0021A Date and time 02.06.93 14:34:59  
To: AREIMAN --VCH0021A Andre Reiman HBRASS --VCH0021A Hugh Brass  
DGREENBE--VCH0021A D. Greenberg AANDRADE--VCH0021A Anthony Andrade  
HREIF --VCH0021A Helmut Reif

From: P. Maglione  
Subject: Smoker issues - an analytical framework

Gentlemen,

Many thanks for all your comments on the "Smoker Issues" framework paper. I must apologize if there has been some confusion as to its exact purpose: it actually emanated from an ETS brainstorming meeting we had last month in London, and was the result of an attempt to link the various tobacco-related issues (tax, advertising, etc, etc) together in a way that senior management could digest rather than have them continue to consider each as a separate and distinct issue requiring a lot of wheel re-inventing and ad hoc, once-off programs of limited effect.

From there we started to toy with the idea of using the same document, or a version thereof, to explain these issues to internal audiences. But your comments, particularly Hugh's, are well taken and add needed perspective to the whole endeavor.

I will now try and integrate everyone's comments into a re-draft, taking care to include various non-tobacco examples as well so as to demonstrate a wider "anti" trend permeating our society. The objective of this re-drafted paper would be to create an internal document that shows that all these anti-smoking trends are in fact part of a more generalized assault by activist groups on individual lifestyles which do not happen to be "politically correct" at this point in time, and how science is mis-used to justify this assault.

I would see the re-drafted document being used as part of Project Info, in a way that gets us away from the usual "us vs. them" discussion of the primary and secondary health issues. It is my opinion that this line of argumentation is unsatisfactory for our own internal audiences on these very important issues; and that we need an alternative which can be adapted to other PM businesses subject to the same pressures, i.e. alcohol, sugar, caffeine, chocolate, cholesterol, etc. Long-term, this may be one way of achieving more sympathy for tobacco industry positions from our food sector workforce... and ultimately, from the wider universe of consumers (i.e., public opinion).

Once again, thanks for the attention and I'll get back to you soon.

Paul

\*\*\* Forwarding note from DGREENBE--VCH0021A 02.06.93 12:27 \*\*\*

To: PHAGLION--VCH0021A P. Maglione DBUSHONG--VCH0021A David Bushong

From: D. Greenberg  
Subject: Smoker issues - an analytical framework  
paul--

as I told you earlier; for what its worth, it may make sense at some point for you to respond or for me to do so on your behalf.

\*\*\* Forwarding note from AREIMAN --VCH0021A 02.06.93 10:25 \*\*\*

To: HBRASS --VCH0021A Hugh Brass

From: Andre Reiman  
Subject: Smoker issues - an analytical framework

Perhaps I did not make myself clear. What I meant to say was exactly what you articulated, that the document is like a checklist of arguments that can be used against us; and is more than that it is a rebuttal of those arguments.

2501234306

2501234306-A

2501234306.B